REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on January 9, 2008, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration.

Claims 1-13, 15-31, and 41-50 are now pending in this Application.

Claims 1-13, 15-31, and 41-50 stand rejected.

In this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 13, and 41 have been amended and claims 2, 3, 15, 16, 23, 24, 42 and 43 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 11, 13, and 41 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-13, 15-31, and 41-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,909,678 to Bergman et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0019844 to Kurowski (Kurowski '844), U.S. Patent No. 6,654,737 to Nunez (Nunez '737) and WC3, HTML 4.01 specification (WC3).

The WC3 reference does not show, teach, or suggest, alone or in combination, a hyperlink target, wherein the hyperlink target is either (i) a link from the form to another location or (ii) a link from the form to another file, as presently claimed in claim 1. The discussion below further clarifies that applicant's claimed hyperlink provides an interactive link for satisfying an element on a form, and is therefore distinguished from a generalized HTML URL name, suggested as the alleged equivalent by the WC3 reference.

The WC3 generally characterizes such a hyperlink as another web resource (12.1.1). In contrast, the claimed hyperlink target incorporates selectivity of a network location or file coupled with invocation from a query or spreadsheet, as disclosed in the specification at page 2, lines 13-16.

In the characterization offered by the Office Action, the cited links are defined in terms of a destination anchor. The cited destination anchor is simply a web resource, and thus do not anticipate the claimed hyperlink target including either (i) a link from the form to another location or (ii) a link from the form to another file. Further, the invoking

entity defines a source anchor (12.1.3), or "A" element, which must be adapted to handle the range of web resources that might be encountered (12.2). In contrast, the claimed hyperlink target requires no such range of attributes to handle a potential range of visited locations, but merely includes either i) a link from the form to another location or (ii) a link from the form to another file, as claimed. In furtherance of this distinction, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the hyperlink target provides a link to a choice satisfying the element on the form, disclosed in the specification at page 4, lines 4-11, as distinguished from the general web resource in the cited WC3 reference. The amended hyperlink targets include either a reference to valid variables, as disclosed at page 4, line 21, or a selection of choices, as disclosed at page 4, line 7. In further distinction, the subject matter of claim 2 has been further incorporated into claim 1, to clarify that the hyperlink control retrieves, from the hyperlink target, an input satisfying a requested query variable, as further discussed in the specification as filed at page 4, lines 25-27 of the specification. Claim 1 is therefore believed distinguished over the cited WC3 reference, alone or in combination.

In further distinction, the Office Action also cites Kurowski, et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0019844) and Nunez (US Pat. No. 6,654,737) in combination with Bergman '678. Nunez '737 teaches only that a hyperlink is a point and click mechanism for efficiently jumping between various locations (col. 2, lines 15-16), as in conventional static hyperlinks. Nowhere does Nunez show, teach, or disclose, alone or in combination, the claimed control that provides a hyperlink target to a plurality of selectable destination locations such as the claimed URL location or file. Both are discussed further below.

Kurowski, generally teaches a distributed computing platform for efficiently allocation the collective pool of computing power included in the network. The Kurowski use of hyperlinks is merely to "activate things" ([0184], line 2). Thus, Kurowski merely recites that a hyperlink may be associated with invoking, for example, an executable object rather then merely accessing a file. Nowhere, however, does Kurowski show, teach, or disclose a selectable manner of identifying hyperlink targets from available predetermined choices. As disclosed in the PCT specification at page 3, lines 20-24, claim 1 has been herein amended to recite that the displayed control includes the

plurality of hyperlink targets, and selecting, via a user action, a hyperlink target from the plurality of hyperlink target, to further distinguish Applicant's invention over Kurowski '844.

Accordingly, one of skill in the art would not look to Kurowski to modify Bergman because Kurowski is directed to allocation a pool of computing power efficiently among a large user group, not for manipulating hyperlinks pointing to multiple locations, or even any user interaction features. To combine Kurowski '844 with Bergman would simply yield a scalable phrase receptacle, having no particular advantage with respect to a hyperlink.

The Office Action further cites the combination of Bergman '678 with Nunez, '737. Nunez shows a predefined database of HTML files interconnected via static hyperlinks (col. 6, lines 18-34). The hyperlinks are static because each is predetermined to refer to a single item. Each Nunez hyperlink points to a single other related database location; e.g. a single document (col. 2, lines 17-21). Accordingly, claim 1 has been herein amended to clarify that the hyperlink includes at least one hyperlink target, each hyperlink target providing the other location or file, to further clarify and distinguish Applicant's claimed invention.

It is further submitted that one of skill in the art would not look to Nunez '737 to modify Bergman '678 because Nunez '737 teaches static hyperlinks for database navigation within a particular database, while Bergman '678 teaches phrase receptacles for text generation. Thus, while Bergman uses the hyperlinks to IMPORT text to the current location, Kurowski employs hyperlinks to traverse to ANOTHER database location.

Independent claim 11, rejected on similar grounds, has been similarly amended and to include subject matter of claim 16, refining the form as a spreadsheet. Independent claim 13 has been amended to recite features similar to claim 1, and independent claim 41 has likewise been amended similarly to claim 11, now all believed allowable for the reasons given above for claim 1.

As the remaining claims depend from, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 11, 13 and 41, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is any fee occasioned by this response that is not paid, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Should the enclosed papers or fees be considered incomplete, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office contact the undersigned collect at the telephone number provided below.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/CJL/_____
Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive, Suite 280
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: OID06-36(07601)

Dated: May 9, 2008